



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,133	09/24/2003	Omayma El-Sayed Moharram	OMCS-001-US	2018
68108 7590 06/19/2009 OMAYMA E. MOHARRAM RR 1 STN MAIN 225 SPRUCE CRESCENT CARLETON PLACE, ON K7C-3P1 CANADA				
EXAMINER ANTONIENKO, DEBRA L				
ART UNIT 3689		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 06/19/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>		Application No. 10/668,133 Examiner DEBRA ANTONIENKO	Applicant(s) MOHARRAM, OMayma EL-SAYED Art Unit 3689
--	--	---	---

All Participants:

(1) Debra Antonienko.

(2) Gerardo Araque.

Date of Interview: 16 June 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Status of Application: _____

(3) Omayma El-Sayed Moharram.

(4) _____

Time: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
1, 31

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Dennis Ruhl/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

In Applicant's most recent Amendment of 23 March 2009, there was confusion as to which amended specification was last entered. Applicant has withdrawn the amended specification of 27 October 2008, under the impression that only certain paragraphs of the amended specification of 29 April 2008 were entered and other paragraphs were not entered. Then Applicant further amended the specification, however, it is unclear now which specification the most recent amendments are addressing. Furthermore, it is unclear which specification the amended claims of 27 October 2008 are intended to reflect.

An interview was initiated in an effort to clarify the record. All of the amended specification of 29 April 2008 has not been entered. The amended specification of 27 October 2008 is considered also not entered. Applicant was informed of the current status. Applicant was advised that any amendments filed to the specification or to the claims from hereon should be in reference to the original specification of 24 September 2003. The Examiner informed the Applicant that a Notice of Non-Compliant would be forwarded in order to remedy these issues with respect to the specification amendment.

Also, the Examiner discussed how 35 USC §101 was being applied to the claims in view of *Bielski*. Search terms for acquiring the CAFC decision online were provided.

Possible new matter issues were discussed as well.